

①

SINGLE BENCH

C.S. 106/05 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWRIT PETITION NO. 5911 OF 2005PETITIONER

Rajendra Kumar Gilahare, S/o.
Shri Lakhnan Lal Gilahare, Aged
about 39 years, R/o. Village
Purena, Post Ravigram, Raipur,
Tahsil & District Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUSRESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh,
Through the Secretary,
Department of Mining,
Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan,
Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Director, Department of
Mining, "Sonakhan Bhawan, Ring
Road No.1, Village Purena, Post
Ravigram, Raipur, District Raipur
(C.G.)
3. The Collector, Raipur, District
Raipur (C.G.)
4. The Mining Officer, Department
of Mining, Collectorate Raipur,
District Raipur (C.G.)
5. Shri Jalandhar Prasad Verma,
Assistant Grade-III, Department
of Mining, Collectorate Raipur,
District Raipur (C.G.)

5911/05
P.R. No. 5911/05
Presented by D.C. Verma
Dated 14.11.05

IN CHARGE
Constitution Cases Section
Office of the Advocate General
State of Chhattisgarh
BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक

WP 5911/05

सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का क्रमांक आदेश सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<u>2-12-2005</u> Shri Devesh Chandra Verma, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Sandeep Dubey, Govt. Advocate and Shri Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer for the State. Application for urgent hearing is allowed. Heard. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as Assistant Grade-III in the Mining Department. He further submits that the petitioner has been transferred vide order dated 9-11-2005 (Annexure-P/2) from Raipur to Bilaspur during the ban period. He also submits that vide order dated 25-8-2005 (Annexure-P/1) respondent No.5 was transferred from Raipur to Bilaspur, but not relieved. Shri Verma submits that all of sudden the transfer order of respondent No.5 was modified and the petitioner was transferred in his place without assigning any reason. Learned counsel for the State is not in a position to point out as to whether prior approval of Chief Minister is obtained or not. However, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner may be directed to make representation before the competent authority and if such representation is filed the same shall be considered and decided on its own merits. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees to the aforesaid proposal made by learned State counsel. Having considered and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, in the opinion of this Court, ends of justice will be served if a direction is given to the petitioner to make a detailed	

[पीछे देखिये]

आदेश पत्रक

Wf 5911/05

मामला क्रमांक

सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
Gowri	representation raising his grievances before the competent authority of respondents alongwith a copy of the petition and this order within a period of two weeks from today and on such representation being filed, the competent authority of the respondents shall decide the same on its own merits in accordance with law as early as possible preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of representation. It is made clear that the petitioner will be allowed to continue on his present place of posting till the representation is decided. With the aforesaid observations, this petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.4704/2005 also stands disposed of. Certified copy as per rules.	Sd/- Fakhruddin Judge

[पीछे देखिये]

3/12/05
21/1/08